

Chapter 30: Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination

30.1	Introduction	30-2
30.2	Stakeholder Committee.....	30-2
30.3	Public Consultation and Coordination	30-5
30.3.1	Scoping.....	30-5
30.3.2	Concept Development and Purpose and Need	30-6
30.3.3	Alternatives Refinement.....	30-7
30.3.4	Tolled Alternatives Analysis	30-8
30.3.5	Environmental Justice Outreach.....	30-9
30.3.6	Public Meetings.....	30-9
30.4	Agency Consultation and Coordination	30-10
30.4.1	Scoping.....	30-10
30.4.2	Purpose and Need, Concept Development, and Alternatives Refinement	30-11
30.5	Municipal Consultation and Coordination	30-11
30.5.1	Scoping.....	30-11
30.5.2	Purpose and Need, Concept Development, and Alternatives Refinement	30-12
30.6	Consultation and Coordination Tools.....	30-15
30.6.1	Printed Publications and Collateral	30-15
30.6.2	Electronic Communication Tools.....	30-16
30.6.3	Speakers' Bureau	30-19
30.6.4	Media Relations	30-20
30.7	Comments Received	30-23
30.8	Use of Public and Agency Comments in the Study Process	30-30
30.8.1	Scoping.....	30-30
30.8.2	Purpose and Need, Development of Alternatives, and Refinement of Alternatives	30-30
30.8.3	Responding to Questions and Anticipating Issues	30-30
30.9	Summary and Conclusion.....	30-31
30.10	References	30-32

30.1 Introduction

The Mountain View Corridor (MVC) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) team proactively shared project information with and sought comments from the public, resource agencies, and municipalities throughout the study process. This chapter summarizes the consultation and coordination activities implemented during scoping, development of the project's purpose and need (see Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action), concept development, alternatives refinement, and the EIS analysis with each of these groups. This section also outlines the communication tools used to support overall efforts.

30.2 Stakeholder Committee

A Stakeholder Committee that consisted of study area mayors, large property owners, and non-government organizations was formed at the start of the EIS process. The committee's primary purpose was to guide decisions related to the Growth Choices process (see Chapter 3, Growth Choices). After the Stakeholder Committee's work was complete with regard to the Growth Choices process, the MVC team continued to meet with this group to provide project updates and gain input to the EIS process. When funding issues and the tolling analysis became part of the MVC project, study area legislators were invited to join the Stakeholder Committee membership as well. Membership also changed over time due to the turnover in local elected officials.

Table 30.2-1 lists the meetings with the Stakeholder Committee. Table 30.2-2 and Table 30.2-3 below list the members of the Stakeholder Committees during and after the Growth Choices process.

Table 30.2-1. Growth Choices Stakeholder Committee Meetings

Date	Location
March 19, 2003	E Center – West Valley City
May 7, 2003	E Center – West Valley City
July 9, 2003	E Center – West Valley City
November 5, 2003	E Center – West Valley City
December 16, 2003	E Center – West Valley City
February 3, 2004	E Center – West Valley City
March 10, 2004	E Center – West Valley City
November 16, 2004	E Center – West Valley City
April 5, 2006	E Center – West Valley City
September 22, 2006	E Center – West Valley City
March 27, 2007	E Center – West Valley City

Table 30.2-2. Growth Choices Stakeholder Committee Membership

Name	Representing
David Nicponski	ATK Aerospace
Mayor Ted Barratt	City of American Fork
Mayor Wayne Mortimer	City of Bluffdale
Mayor Lynn Crane	City of Herriman
Mayor Larry Ellertson	City of Lindon
Mayor Jim Danklef	City of Pleasant Grove
Mayor Timothy Parker	City of Saratoga Springs
Mayor Kent Money	City of South Jordan
Mayor Janice Auger	City of Taylorsville
Mayor Bryan Holladay	City of West Jordan
Jim Clark	Envision Utah
Roger Borgenicht	Future Moves Coalition
Mary Gracia	Great Salt Lake Audubon
Raymond Jensen	Jordan School District
Vicki Varela	Kennecott Land
Heather Miller	Lehi Chamber of Commerce
Mayor Kenneth Greenwood	Lehi City
John Milliken	Milcon Inc.
Darrell Cook	Mountainland Association of Governments
Robert Grow, Esq.	O'Melveny & Myers
Mayor Mont Evans	Riverton City
Jess Agraz	Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce
Mayor Ross "Rocky" Anderson	Salt Lake City Corporation
Councilman Michael Jensen	Salt Lake County
Deputy Mayor Alan Dayton	Salt Lake County
David White	Salt Lake County Planning & Development Services Division
Nina Dougherty	Sierra Club–Southwest Region
Jim Sorenson, Jr.	Sorenson Development Company
Collette Tomlinson	Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce
Greg Gagon	Thanksgiving Point
Bishop M. David Burton	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
Mayor Kelvin Bailey	Town of Eagle Mountain
Commissioner Gary Herbert	Utah County
John Njord	Utah Department of Transportation
Representative David Hogue	Utah House of Representatives – District 52
Colonel Scott Olson	Utah National Guard
John Inglish	Utah Transit Authority
Chuck Chappell	Wasatch Front Regional Council
Paul D. Isaac	West Valley City

Table 30.2-3. Post–Growth Choices Stakeholder Committee Membership

Name	Representing
Mayor Heber Thompson	American Fork City
Mayor Claudia Anderson	Bluffdale City
Rick Horst	City of South Jordan
Gary Luebbers	City of West Jordan
Mayor David B. Newton	City of West Jordan
Carson Howell	Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget
John Nixon	Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget
Nathan Darnall	Great Salt Lake Audubon
Herb Jensen	Jordan School District
Peter McMahon	Kennecott Land
Russell Fox	Kennecott Land
Mayor Howard	Lehi City
Mayor Jeff Acerson	Lindon City
Dan Nelson	Mountainland Association of Governments
Mark Bleazard	Office of Legislative Fiscal Analysis
Frank Mills	Pleasant Grove City
Mayor Mike Daniels	Pleasant Grove City
Mayor Bill Applegarth	Riverton City
Robin Riggs	Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce
D.J. Baxter	Salt Lake City Corporation
Mayor Peter Corroon	Salt Lake County
Marc Heilesen	Sierra Club – Southwest Region
Brian Watson	Sorenson Development
Don Wallace	Sorenson Development
Suzanne Schilling	Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce
Mayor Russ Wall	Taylorsville City
Mayor Brian B. Olsen	Town of Eagle Mountain
Mayor Don Richardson	Town of Eagle Mountain
Mike Wren	Town of Eagle Mountain
Commissioner Larry Ellertson	Utah County Commission
Carlos Braceras	Utah Department of Transportation
Dave Nazare	Utah Department of Transportation
Randy Park	Utah Department of Transportation
Representative Carl Duckworth	Utah House of Representatives – District 22
Representative Jennifer M. Seelig	Utah House of Representatives – District 23
Representative Duane Bourdeaux	Utah House of Representatives – District 23
Representative David Litvack	Utah House of Representatives – District 26
Representative John Dougall	Utah House of Representatives – District 27
Representative Janice M. Fisher	Utah House of Representatives – District 29
Representative Ron Bigelow	Utah House of Representatives – District 32
Representative Eric K. Hutchings	Utah House of Representatives – District 38
Representative James A. Dunnigan	Utah House of Representatives – District 39
Representative Todd E. Kiser	Utah House of Representatives – District 41
Representative Peggy Wallace	Utah House of Representatives – District 42

Name	Representing
Representative Wayne A. Harper	Utah House of Representatives – District 43
Representative Stephan R. Mascaro	Utah House of Representatives – District 47
Speaker Greg J. Curtis	Utah House of Representatives – District 49
Representative Merlynn Newbold	Utah House of Representatives – District 50
Representative David N. Cox	Utah House of Representatives – District 56
Lt. Colonel Rick West	Utah National Guard Headquarters
Lt. Colonel Robert Dunton	Utah National Guard Headquarters
Senator Fred Fife	Utah State Senate – District 1
Senator Ed Mayne	Utah State Senate – District 5
Senator Michael G. Waddoups	Utah State Senate – District 6
Senator D. Chris Buttars	Utah State Senate – District 10
Senator Howard A. Stephenson	Utah State Senate – District 11
Senator Brent Goodfellow	Utah State Senate – District 12
Senator Mark B. Madsen	Utah State Senate – District 13
President John L. Valentine	Utah State Senate – District 14
Senator Greg Bell	Utah State Senate – District 22
Commissioner Glen E. Brown	Utah Transportation Commission
Commissioner J. Kent Millington	Utah Transportation Commission
Commissioner Jan Wells	Utah Transportation Commission
Mike Allegra	Utah Transit Authority
David Creer	Utah Trucking Association
Joseph Moore	West Valley City
Mayor Dennis Nordfelt	West Valley City

30.3 Public Consultation and Coordination

30.3.1 Scoping

Scoping is a key part of the EIS process and involves soliciting public and agency participation in order to identify issues and develop alternatives. The official scoping phase for the MVC EIS began April 15, 2003, and ended September 15, 2003. As part of the scoping effort, the project was published in the May 2, 2003, *Federal Register* with an invitation for the public to provide initial scoping comments. A complete description of scoping activities and results is provided in the Scoping Report (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2003); also see Section 2.1.2, Identification of Preliminary Alternatives, in Chapter 2.

Public scoping efforts by the MVC EIS team included conducting media outreach; providing a project speakers' bureau, Web site, and telephone comment line; participating in public visioning workshops held in conjunction with the Growth Choices process; and distributing comment forms to the public through libraries, city buildings, and local businesses.



The combined efforts of the project partners resulted in a considerable response to scoping strategies. More than 250 stakeholders responded to the request for comments and provided more than 700 individual statements regarding their issues and concerns. Additionally, about 300 people attended six Growth Choices workshops and provided 49 individual comments.

Public scoping comments revealed three distinct areas of interest and concern. First, the public recognized the need for improvements to the transportation system in the MVC study area. Second, they were interested in the development of an effective, multimodal solution that addresses existing congestion and future growth. Third, citizens were concerned about the preservation of the environment.

The MVC EIS team compiled a list of more than 300 potential actions based on public and agency comments. These potential actions were combined with those found in the Wasatch Front Regional Council and Mountainland Association of Governments long-range transportation plans and previous planning studies and were screened using a vigorous two-level screening process. A complete description of the screening process and results is provided in the Alternatives Screening Report (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2004a).

30.3.2 Concept Development and Purpose and Need

The MVC EIS team announced the outcome of the screening process, introduced the resulting roadway and transit concepts to the public, and invited public and agency comments between July and September 2004. At that point in the project, two transit concepts were under consideration as well as four roadway concepts in Salt Lake County and four roadway concepts in Utah County. The draft purpose and need chapter and the Alternatives Screening Report, which detailed the process of arriving at the two transit and eight roadway concepts, were also made available for public and agency comments. These documents were provided in hard copy to cooperating agencies and were made available at public libraries for public review. The documents were also available in electronic form on the project Web site.

The public outreach regarding these concepts was designed to seek input from stakeholders who might be directly affected by the project as well as potential future users of the transit and roadway corridors.

The MVC EIS team used a comprehensive approach to reach potentially affected stakeholders along the identified roadway and transit concepts. This approach included distributing 9,500 flyers door-to-door along the alignments and holding nine public gatherings in neighborhood parking lots at a mobile billboard called the “Talk Truck” (see Section 7.3.2, Public Outreach). The Talk Truck drove in potentially affected neighborhoods and parked in highly visible locations along



the corridor. The Talk Truck displayed the project Web site address and telephone comment line number. Talk Truck gatherings were held in visible locations within potentially affected neighborhoods including school parking lots, grocery store parking lots, and neighborhood parks. Project representatives talked with individuals and small groups using handouts and display boards. The presentation consisted of a project overview and explanation of the roadway and transit concepts identified for further study. Talk Truck gatherings were attended by an average of 80 people, ranging from 40 people to more than 250 people. In total, more than 720 people attended the nine Talk Truck gatherings, and more than 1,000 comments were received.

Potential future users throughout the MVC study area were invited to provide comments on the concepts using multimedia tools. The media tools included media coverage and radio advertising that primarily focused on encouraging people to visit the project Web site. Eighteen news stories were published in daily and monthly publications and reached an estimated 544,805 people. Radio advertising is estimated to have been heard by 320,500 people. The project Web site had more than 20,000 visits during this comment period.

Public comments on the concepts helped the team refine the alternatives and understand key issues at this stage of the study. Key issues identified in public comments included concern about property acquisitions and impacts, the timeline for making a decision, questions about who makes the final decision, and the construction schedule for transit and roadway improvements. Numerous public comments also questioned why State Route (SR) 111 was dropped as a roadway concept (see Section 2.1.4, Alternatives Screening Report). Additional details about the community outreach during concept development are available in the Alternatives Rollout Results Report (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2004b).

30.3.3 Alternatives Refinement

The MVC EIS team held additional public meetings as the initial concepts were designed and refined. Four neighborhood meetings targeting directly affected areas were held in May and June 2005 to provide more detail to the public about the location and width of the transit and roadway alternatives. Details such as transit station locations, interchange locations, frontage roads and collector-distributor systems, and number of roadway lanes were provided at the public meetings. The meetings were announced using the project e-mail update list, direct mail, and door-to-door flyer distribution. An average of 150 people attended each meeting, with actual meeting attendance ranging from 50 people to 250 people. In total, about 600 people attended the four meetings.

The public comments during this project stage continued to focus on property issues. The public also conveyed a strong desire that a decision should be made



as soon as possible. Because multiple alignments were under consideration, stakeholders on all alignments wanted to know when they would find out whether their property might be affected.

In the late fall of 2006, the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) selected Preferred Transit and Freeway Alternatives in Salt Lake County. A public open house was held in January 2007 to provide the public with information about the alternatives and clarify that the alternatives information would still be reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) before it issues the Record of Decision. The open house was announced using the project e-mail update list, direct mail, and flyers distributed by community groups. About 310 people attended the Salt Lake County alternatives update open house.

As a result of coordination and consultation with resource agencies, alternatives in Utah County were further refined and revised to reduce impacts to communities and wetlands. Two open houses, held in December 2006 and March 2007, provided an opportunity for the MVC EIS team to update the public and answer questions about the revised alternatives. The meetings were announced using the project e-mail update list, direct mail, and door-to-door flyer distribution. More than 500 people attended the two Utah County alternatives update open houses.

30.3.4 Tolloed Alternatives Analysis

In early 2006, the MVC EIS team was asked to study the effect that tolling would have on the alternatives under consideration. The request came in response to a projected \$16.5-billion roadway transportation funding shortfall in Utah. Tolling is a relatively new concept in Utah and is only one option being considered to help fund the MVC. The MVC EIS team facilitated public discussions about transportation funding issues, why tolling was being considered, and what tolling in Utah might look like.

The MVC EIS team held 15 town hall meetings between May and July 2006. The meetings included a presentation, a question-and-answer session, and an open house. The meetings were announced using the project e-mail update list, city newsletters, and direct mail from local officials. Posters were placed in city buildings and libraries. An average of 40 people attended each town hall meeting.

Public comments on tolling reflected a mixed reaction. While some people were opposed to tolling, others recognized the need to study it. The concerns raised included issues of fairness, costs, usage, and ownership.

In November 2006, the MVC EIS team organized a tolling panel discussion for the Utah Transportation Commission that was open to the public, followed by a



public open house. The half-day meeting included information from three panels: (1) provider's perspective (policy-makers and government officials with the authority to determine funding), (2) MVC tolling analysis, and (3) user's perspective and local issues.

Each panelist had 5 to 8 minutes to make a statement, followed by questions from the commission. The public had the opportunity to ask questions of all panelists and make comments at the end of the session. A court reporter documented the proceedings.

30.3.5 Environmental Justice Outreach

The MVC EIS team took proactive steps to provide information to and receive comments from environmental justice populations in the study area (see Chapter 7, Environmental Justice). Based on demographic research, Spanish translation needs were identified in portions of the corridor. As a result, key project materials were translated into Spanish, and translation services were provided at public meetings. Meeting invitation flyers were printed in English and Spanish, and ethnic media were included in project news release distributions. The project team made presentations to the Hispanic Chamber. A specific e-mail address (mvcespanol@utah.gov) was provided, and the telephone comment line greeting stated that comments could be submitted in Spanish.

30.3.6 Public Meetings

In addition to providing a variety of opportunities for public information and involvement through the project Web site and comment forms, the MVC EIS team held a series of public meetings at key milestones during the EIS process. The public was invited to public meetings during scoping, concept development, alternatives refinement, and tolled alternatives analysis (see Figure 30-1, Public Meeting Locations and Drop Box Locations, and Table 30.3-1). Public meetings were held throughout the study area with a concentration of meetings in areas of potential direct impacts. The stakeholder contact database grew with each set of public meetings, indicating that the meetings consistently attracted new stakeholder contacts who had not previously been involved with the project.

Table 30.3-1. Public Meeting Notification Methods

Public Meeting Notification Methods	
Direct mailing	Media release
E-mail updates	Media advertising – print and radio
Door-to-door flyer distribution	Talk Truck mobile billboard
City newsletters	Posters

▲ ▲

The MVC EIS team also provided project updates to the Utah Transportation Commission throughout the study process (see Table 30.3-2). Transportation Commission meetings are open to the public and are on public record.

Table 30.3-2. Transportation Commission Meeting Presentations

Date	Location
August 22, 2003	Coalville, UT
August 20, 2004	Morgan, UT
September 23, 2005	Tooele, UT
February 17, 2006	Salt Lake City, UT
March 10, 2006	Kanab, UT
May 25, 2006	Bountiful, UT
June 14, 2006	Salt Lake City, UT
July 14, 2006	Logan, UT
August 11, 2006	Beaver, UT
September 15, 2006	Vernal, UT
October 20, 2006	Hurricane, UT
November 9, 2006	Sandy, UT
December 8, 2006	Salt Lake City, UT
February 16, 2007	Salt Lake City, UT
May 23, 2007	Salt Lake City, UT

30.4 Agency Consultation and Coordination

Formal and informal meetings were held throughout the preparation of the MVC EIS to facilitate communication with local, state, and federal agencies. FHWA and UDOT worked closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah Department of Environmental Quality, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Utah State Historic Preservation Office, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and other agencies to keep them informed of the project status and the issues being addressed in response to public and agency concerns.

30.4.1 Scoping

In April 2003, the MVC EIS team sent a letter to 26 agencies requesting scoping comments. An invitation to an agency scoping meeting accompanied the letter. The agency scoping meeting was held on Thursday, June 5, 2003, from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM at UDOT Region 2 headquarters. Fifteen federal and state agency representatives attended. Agencies not in attendance were sent a follow-up packet of information consistent with the materials provided at the meeting.

▼ ▼

Fifteen agencies provided comments during meetings or by letter during the scoping period. Resource agencies identified issues of concern and potential solutions for the MVC in their scoping comments.

30.4.2 Purpose and Need, Concept Development, and Alternatives Refinement

Agency comments on the initial roadway and transit concepts helped the MVC EIS team refine the alternatives and understand key issues at this stage of the study. Agencies were also consulted to enhance the quality of the work being done by directly involving them in issues such as the project's purpose and need, the alternatives, and the analysis conducted for wetlands, wildlife, water quality, air quality, noise, farmlands, floodplains, threatened and endangered species, cultural resources, social and economic impacts, and hazardous waste.

During the preparation of the EIS, the resource agencies worked with MVC resource specialists to develop technical memoranda on the approach to the analysis in the EIS. The technical memoranda described methodologies for analyzing different resources. These memoranda were approved by the relevant resource agencies before the analyses were conducted to ensure that an acceptable approach was being used. In addition, routine meetings were held to update the agencies on the progress of the analysis and any changes to the approach that might have been required in order to complete the analysis. For example, routine meetings were held with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regarding the wetland and wildlife analysis to make sure that all of the agencies agreed with the analysis being performed. The technical memoranda and notes taken during these meetings are in the MVC project file.

30.5 Municipal Consultation and Coordination

The MVC EIS team coordinated with local municipalities throughout the project. Municipal coordination included interacting with staff and elected officials.

30.5.1 Scoping

During the scoping period, local government officials and staff were encouraged to provide comments using a variety of tools including the project Web site and telephone comment line. Municipalities also played a key role during the Growth Choices process.

Mayors were formally invited to participate in the Growth Choices Stakeholder Committee (see Section 30.2, Stakeholder Committee). This committee

▲ ▲

developed the Growth Choices Vision Scenario, and the members signed an agreement supporting seven principles for local growth and planning. See Chapter 3, Growth Choices, for more information.

Municipal scoping comments revealed that each jurisdiction has unique areas of concern relating to its location in the MVC study area. Municipalities in northern Salt Lake County were concerned about the alignment identified in the Western Transportation Corridor study and generally expressed concern about impacts if that alignment were used. Southern Salt Lake County municipalities preferred that the Western Transportation Corridor alignment be used because it had already been incorporated into master plans, and any change would cause considerable impacts. Northwestern Utah County municipalities expressed concern about how long the studies were taking and felt that solutions would not be implemented quickly enough to address the ongoing growth in the area.

30.5.2 Purpose and Need, Concept Development, and Alternatives Refinement

City staff had a role in defining concepts and refining alternatives. A series of alternatives workshops was held with city staff to gain input on design details such as transit station locations, interchange locations, and park-and-ride lot locations. The MVC EIS team also made numerous presentations to city councils, planning commissions, and other municipal organizations on request and held meetings with individual municipal staff.

The purpose of city council and planning commission presentations was to provide project updates to elected officials. The purpose of municipal staff meetings varied based on project issues related to concept development, alternatives refinement, pending residential or commercial developments, and weighing impacts data (see Table 30.5-1, Table 30.5-2, Table 30.5-3, and Table 30.5-4 below).

▼ ▼

Table 30.5-1. Additional Stakeholder Committee Members – Post-Growth Choices

Name	Representing
Mayor Claudia Anderson	Bluffdale City
Rick Horst	City of South Jordan
Mayor David B. Newton	City of West Jordan
Nathan Darnall	Great Salt Lake Audubon
Russell Fox	Kennecott Land
Mayor Howard Johnson	Lehi City
Mayor Jeff Acerson	Lindon City
Dan Nelson	Mountainland Association of Governments
Robin Riggs	Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce
D.J. Baxter	Salt Lake City Corporation
Mayor Peter Corroon	Salt Lake County
Mark Heilesen	Sierra Club – Southwest Region
Senator Ed Mayne	Utah State Senate – District 5
Senator Fred Fife	Utah State Senate – District 1
Senator Howard A. Stephenson	Utah State Senate – District 11
Senator Mark B. Madsen	Utah State Senate – District 13
Senator Greg Bell	Utah State Senate – District 22
Senator D. Chris Butters	Utah State Senate – District 10
Senator Brent Goodfellow	Utah State Senate – District 12
Senator Michael G. Waddoups	Utah State Senate – District 6
President John L. Valentine	Utah State Senate – District 14
Carlos Bracerias	Utah Department of Transportation
Representative Janice M. Fisher	Utah House of Representatives – District 29
Representative Merlynn Newbold	Utah House of Representatives – District 50
Representative Todd E. Kiser	Utah House of Representatives – District 41
Representative Wayne A. Harper	Utah House of Representatives – District 43
Representative Ron Bigelow	Utah House of Representatives – District 32
Representative Duane E. Bourdeaux	Utah House of Representatives – District 23
Representative David N. Cox	Utah House of Representatives – District 56
Speaker Greg J. Curtis	Utah House of Representatives – District 49
Representative John Dougall	Utah House of Representatives – District 27
Representative Carl Duckworth	Utah House of Representatives – District 22

▲ ▲

**Table 30.5-2. Municipal Alternatives
Development Workshops**

Date	Location
March 22, 2004	Utah County
July 29, 2004	Salt Lake County
July 29, 2004	Utah County
October 27, 2004	Salt Lake County
April 3, 2006	Utah County
April 4, 2006	Salt Lake County
October 26, 2006	Utah County
December 11, 2006	Utah County
February 28, 2007	Utah County

**Table 30.5-3. City Council and Planning
Commission Presentations**

Municipality	Number of City Council or Commission Meetings Attended
Salt Lake County	6
Bluffdale	4
Copperton	3
Herriman	3
Kearns	5
Magna	8
Riverton	4
Salt Lake City	4
South Jordan	3
Taylorsville	2
West Jordan	5
West Valley City	7
Utah County	5
American Fork	5
Eagle Mountain	4
Lehi	6
Lindon	7
Pleasant Grove	7
Saratoga Springs	6

**Table 30.5-4. Municipal Coordination
Meetings**

Municipality	Number of Meetings with Staff or Elected Officials
Salt Lake County	13
Bluffdale	24
Herriman	12
Riverton	14
Salt Lake City	15
South Jordan	8
West Jordan	21
West Valley City	32
Utah County	3
American Fork	6
Eagle Mountain	3
Lehi	24
Lindon	10
Pleasant Grove	10
Saratoga Springs	15

▼ ▼

30.6 Consultation and Coordination Tools

30.6.1 Printed Publications and Collateral

Printed materials were used throughout the MVC EIS process to inform stakeholders about the project and to request comments. Several newsletters and project updates were published during the project (see Table 30.6-1). These were distributed by mail, at drop-off points throughout the MVC study area such as city halls and public libraries, and as portable document format (PDF) files on the project Web site. Comment forms and comment drop boxes were placed in local libraries and city halls throughout the study area during the scoping phase and the concept development phase. Comment drop boxes were also placed in cooperating grocery stores in the study area during the scoping phase (see Figure 30-1, Public Meeting Locations and Drop Box Locations).

Table 30.6-1. Newsletters

Publication Date	Topic
November 2003	Scoping Follow-up
July 2004	Concepts
May 2005	Location and Width
May 2006	Transportation Funding and Tolling Analysis
January 2007	Salt Lake County Alternatives Update
March 2007	Utah County Alternatives Update

The draft purpose and need chapter and Alternatives Screening Report were published for public review in July 2004. These documents were available at public libraries in the study area as well as on the project Web site. Detailed maps showing the concept alignments on an aerial photograph were made available at libraries and on the project Web site in July 2004. These maps were updated in May 2005 to show the alternatives' location and width. The maps were updated again in 2007 with the alignments carried forward for detailed study in the Draft EIS.

Other documents such as Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and Comment Summaries were distributed at public meetings and made available on the project Web site.

30.6.2 Electronic Communication Tools

Several electronic communication tools were used to provide project information and receive comments. Tools for distributing project information included the project Web site (www.udot.utah.gov/mountainview) and periodic e-mail updates sent to stakeholders who requested to receive project information. Tools for receiving comments included an online comment form as part of the project Web site, a project e-mail address (mountainview@utah.gov), a Spanish-language project e-mail address (mvcespanol@utah.gov), and a toll-free telephone comment line (800-596-2556). The comment line also provided a Spanish-language option for callers.

30.6.2.1 Project Web Site

The MVC EIS team launched a project Web site as soon as public scoping began in the spring of 2003. The site, www.udot.utah.gov/mountainview, provided a forum for gathering public comments as well as disseminating project information (see Table 30.6-2 and Table 30.6-3 below). Other public communications directed residents in the MVC study area and other stakeholders to the Web site for detailed project information. For each phase of the project, members of the public were invited to comment using the site, and then the project team posted reports that demonstrated how the comments were being used to develop the EIS. Site content was updated as new information became available, roughly on a quarterly basis throughout the project. Web site visitor sessions and comments received on the site remained constant, with short increases in web site use occurring during public outreach efforts related to specific project milestones.

Table 30.6-2. Documents Available on the Project Web Site

Available Documents		
Alternatives Screening Report	Purpose and Need Document	Results Newsletter #1
Results Newsletter #2	Results Newsletter #2 – Spanish	Results Newsletter #3
Results Newsletter #3 – Spanish	Concepts Rollout FAQs	Public Scoping FAQs
Right-of-Way FAQs	Right-of-Way FAQs – Spanish	Tolling FAQs
Tolling FAQs – Spanish	Comment Summaries – “What people are saying...”	Tolling Analysis Results
SR 111 Elimination Report	Transit Alternatives – Salt Lake County	Managed Lanes Report

Table 30.6-3. Illustrations Available on the Project Web Site

Available Illustrations		
Salt Lake County Roadway Alternatives Graphic Maps	Utah County Roadway Alternatives Graphic Maps	Transit Alternatives Graphic Maps
Salt Lake County Roadway Alternatives GIS Aerial Maps	Utah County Roadway Alternatives Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Aerial Maps	MVC Study Area Map
Design Elements Graphics	Population Projection Map	Project Schedule
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Timeline	EIS Process Chart	

30.6.2.2 E-mail Update List

The e-mail update list was established as a method to communicate with stakeholders who had participated in the public involvement process and had requested to be added to the update list. E-mail updates were sent as part of key milestone outreach efforts. The updates were also used to encourage continued participation and to follow up with stakeholders after a public event (see Table 30.6-4 below). The initial e-mail update list consisted of about 120 stakeholders. The e-mail update list has grown to more than 1,600 stakeholders during the course of public outreach in preparation of the Draft EIS.

▲ ▲

Table 30.6-4. E-mail Updates

Date	Topic	Number of E-mails Sent
June 2003	Do You Have Opinions about Transportation in Your Community? We Want To Hear Them!	128
August 2003	Comment Forms	128
August 2003	Preliminary Maps Representing Public Input from MVC Workshops Now Available Online	128
November 2003	November Public Meetings	128
December 2003	Report on Preliminary Public Comments	128
March 2004	Salt Lake County Residents Can Preview Transportation Alternatives at City Council	134
June 2004	MVC Alternatives To Be Released for Public Comment Soon	165
July 2004	Public Meetings To Discuss MVC Concepts	165
September 2004	One Thousand Comments Received on MVC Concepts	665
November 2004	MVC Design Elements Available	665
February 2005	MVC Information about Right-of-Way Acquisition Procedures Available	859
April 2005	MVC Design Elements Available – Public Encouraged To Access Information Online	851
May 2005	MVC Update Meetings	883
July 2006	Project Update – Funding, Upcoming Town Hall Meetings	1,182
August 2006	Project Update – Town Hall Meeting Recap	1,343
November 2006	Tolling Panel Discussion and Project Open House	1,342
November 2006	Utah County Alignment Shift Open House	1,333
December 2006	5800 West Identified as UDOT's Preferred Alternative	1,327
January 2007	Salt Lake County Alternative Open House	1,484
January 2007	Salt Lake County Alternative Open House Reminder	1,484
March 2007	Utah County Alternatives Open House	1,609
May 2007	2100 North Identified as UDOT's Preferred Alternative	2,240

▼ ▼

30.6.3 Speakers' Bureau

A project speakers' bureau was formed to proactively provide information to organized groups and respond to requests for presentations. In addition to city council and planning commission presentations, the MVC EIS offered speakers' bureau presentations to community clubs and organizations (see Table 30.6-5). To date, 24 presentations have been given during the study process (see Table 30.6-6). Groups ranged in size from less than 10 people to more than 100 attendees.

Table 30.6-5. Speakers' Bureau Offer Letters

Date	Quantity
2003	32 organizations
2005	36 organizations

Table 30.6-6. Speakers' Bureau Community Club and Organization Presentations

Municipality	Group	Date
West Jordan	Chamber	June 25, 2003
West Jordan	Rotary	August 19, 2003
Utah Valley	Regional Planning Committee	October 2, 2003
Southwest Valley	Chamber of Commerce	October 9, 2003
Copper Creek	Development Homeowner Association	October 22, 2003
Salt Lake City	Associated Builders & Constructors	November 6, 2003
Various	Chamber West	November 18, 2003
Salt Lake County	Regional Growth Committee	November 20, 2003
Utah County	Eagle's Auxiliary	January 6, 2004
Provo	Kiwanis of Provo (Golden K)	February 2, 2004
Utah Valley	Exchange Club	February 5, 2004
West Valley City	Regional Trails Committee	September 21, 2004
West Jordan	Community Expo	January 8, 2005
Salt Lake City	Council of Governments	May 5, 2005
Magna	Magna Center for Family Medicine	May 9, 2005
Saratoga Springs	Homeowners Associations	September 22, 2005
West Valley City	Kiwanis Club – West	October 6, 2005
Salt Lake City	Board of Realtors	May 9, 2006
Salt Lake City	Hispanic Chamber of Commerce	July 11, 2006
Salt Lake City	Motor Carrier Advisory Board	July 20, 2006
Salt Lake City	Salt Lake Business Meeting	August 8, 2006
Lehi	Lyle and Annette Gomm and others	February 6, 2007
Eagle Mountain	Transportation Open House (SR 73)	April 18, 2007
Lehi	Businesses Meeting	April 24, 2007

30.6.4 Media Relations

The MVC EIS team used local and statewide media to help inform the general public about the project and tell stakeholders where they could get more information about the project. Media information kits were produced and distributed to pitch news coverage of the MVC during scoping, concept development, tolling outreach, and the Draft EIS. Media information kits were hand-delivered to reporters and editors. The MVC EIS team explained the information kit contents and made project representatives available for interviews.

The contents of the media kits included news releases, fact sheets, maps, and CD-ROMs of relevant graphics. News releases and media advisories were distributed at various points during the project, typically to announce an upcoming meeting (see Table 30.6-7). More than 270 stories were published or broadcast in local or statewide media during the study process (see Table 30.6-8 below).

Table 30.6-7. News Releases and Media Advisories

Date	Title
April 15, 2003	Mountain View Corridor Tool Kit
May 26, 2003	MVC Growth and Transportation Workshop – Riverton
May 26, 2003	MVC Growth and Transportation Workshop – West Jordan
June 2, 2003	MVC Growth and Transportation Workshop – Pleasant Grove
June 2, 2003	MVC Growth and Transportation Workshop – West Valley City
July 1, 2003	Website, E-mail, Phone Number, and Mailing Address To Facilitate Public Input for the MVC
August 1, 2003	MVC EIS Team Meeting with Technical Staff at Cities To Gather Feedback
August 12, 2003	Maps Representing Public Input from Mountain View Corridor Workshops Now Available Online
October 8, 2003	Upcoming Public Meeting Will Present West Side Transportation Options Based on MVC “Growth Choices” Workshops Last Spring
October 21, 2003	Upcoming Public Meetings Will Present Transportation and Land Use Scenarios Based on MVC “Growth Choices” Workshops Last Spring
November 11, 2003	MVC Public Meetings Planned To Present Transportation and Land Use Scenarios Based on “Growth Choices” Workshops Last Spring
July 15, 2004	MVC Concepts Narrowed from More Than 300 to Eight
November 12, 2004	MVC Stakeholder Committee Meeting and Presentation of Concept Design Elements
November 16, 2004	MVC Design Elements Presented
February 5, 2005	Mountain View Corridor “Footprint” Open Houses
April 4, 2006	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Funding and Town Hall Meetings

Date	Title
April 5, 2006	Officials Explore Funding Options for the Mountain View Corridor
April 28, 2006	Bluffdale – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
April 28, 2006	Saratoga Springs – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
May 5, 2006	West Jordan – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
May 15, 2006	Herriman, Pleasant Grove, Riverton – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
May 16, 2006	Kearns – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
May 17, 2006	Magna – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
May 18, 2006	American Fork, Eagle Mountain, Lehi, Lindon – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
June 1, 2006	West Valley City – Public Invited To Learn About Funding Options for MVC
August 11, 2006	Mountain View Corridor Wraps Up Town Hall Meetings
September 20, 2006	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Tolling Analysis Findings and Tolling Panel Discussion
October 25, 2006	Tolling Panel Discussion
November 2, 2006	Tolling Panel Discussion – Blogs
November 6, 2006	Tolling Panel Discussion
November 9, 2006	Post Event Release – “Mountain View Corridor and Tolling: A Panel Discussion”
November 30, 2006	Utah County Alignments
December 8, 2006	UDOT Preferred Alternative Release “5800 West”
January 16, 2007	Salt Lake County Open House
March 23, 2007	Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Review of Growth Choices and Sequencing
May 23, 2007	UDOT Preferred Alternative Release “2100 North Freeway”

▲ ▲

Table 30.6-8. Media Outlets Covering the MVC

Source	Number of Stories (2003 – May 2007)
Salt Lake Tribune	57
Deseret Morning News	81
Daily Herald	32
Herald Extras	6
Ogden Standard-Examiner	9
West Valley Journal	4
Magna Times	1
Kearns/Taylorsville Journal	5
West Jordan Journal	14
South Valley Journal	2
KSL	20
KTVX	6
KUTV	2
The Spectrum	2
KSTU	11
Crossroads Journal	2
Davis County Clipper	5
Governing Magazine	1
New Utah	3
University of Utah Web site	1
SmartGrowth Online	1
West Valley News	4
Pleasant Grove Review	1
Riverton City Newspaper	1
Lake Mountain Interactive	1
Local Spanish media	1
Herald Journal	1
KCPW	1

▼ ▼

30.7 Comments Received

All correspondence received from the general public, resource agencies, municipalities, and other stakeholder groups was documented in a comment database. Monthly comment reports were generated for the project team to review. About 3,000 public comments were received prior to the public hearing and formal Draft EIS public comment period.

During the project, the number of incoming comments generally increased when the project team provided new public information and conducted public outreach in the form of public meetings, e-mail updates, or other public outreach methods. Figure 30-2.1 through Figure 30-2.4, Mountain View Corridor Public Involvement Process and Timeline, show the major stages of public outreach and the spike in comments received as related to public outreach activities.

Comments reflected a wide range of issues and concerns including the natural and built environments, property acquisition process, alternatives identification and refinement process, tolling analysis, transportation needs, and transit service. Public and agency input shaped the definition of the project's purpose and need, the definition of alternatives, and the formation of public information materials. For example, public comments in 2004 about SR 111 as a possible alternative prompted the project team to further analyze SR 111 after screening it out. A more detailed report about the SR 111 analysis was posted to the project Web site to help explain why the existing Salt Lake County alternatives functioned better than SR 111. Public and agency comments in 2006 prompted another look at the range of alternatives in Utah County and had a direct effect on the alternatives studied in detail in the Draft EIS. Questions and comments about property acquisition led the project team to post more-detailed maps to the project Web site so that property owners could view their parcel in relation to the alternative alignments as well as the development of right-of-way. Table 30.7-1 and Table 30.7-2 below summarize the general disposition of comments from each study area community prior to the release of the Draft EIS.



Table 30.7-1. Summary of Salt Lake County Comments

City/Township	Public Comments	City/Township Disposition
Salt Lake City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freeway could negatively affect all areas of the environment: air, noise, wildlife, open space, and wetlands. Include bicycle and pedestrian trails. Improve east-west routes. I am buying/building/selling property along the proposed route – how will the facility affect me? Provide both bus rapid transit and TRAX lines. Build regional commuter rail from Brigham City to Payson. Build light rail. Extend TRAX line to the airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Varying levels of support among staff and administration. Previous opposition to any freeway in Salt Lake City. Staff understands need for freeway facility and have verbally indicated preference for 5800 West freeway. Supportive of Growth Choices. Want transit line to make loop west of airport to connect to future development.
Salt Lake County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inequity of tolling a facility on the west side. I am buying/building/selling property along the proposed route – how will the facility affect me? <i>Also see comments from Magna and Kearns Townships.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with impacts to Magna and Kearns. Concern about impacts and improvements to east-west arterials. Concern with interchange locations. Concern with connectivity between highway and transit line. More concern with future transit farther west as a part of long-range transportation plan.
West Valley City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about impacts to individual properties from the 5800 West Freeway and 7200 West Freeway Alternatives. Inequity of tolling a facility on the west side. Build on 7200 West because there are fewer impacts to homes and businesses. It will be safer away from power corridor, cost less, and I won't lose my home. Build on 5800 West because the power corridor is already preserved and there are fewer impacts to homes, businesses, schools, churches. It will cost less and I won't lose my home. Improve east-west routes first; they are the real problem. Freeway could negatively affect all areas of the environment: air, noise, wildlife, and wetlands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize need for project. Concern about community impacts. Staff have verbally indicated support for 5800 West freeway. City council passed a resolution identifying 5800 West as a preference if MVC goes through West Valley City. Concern about impacts and improvements to east-west arterials. Council passed moratorium on new building in the corridor for 6 months to help minimize impacts. Supportive of Growth Choices process. Supportive of either transit option, but prefer center-running (Dedicated Right-of-Way Transit Option).





City/Township	Public Comments	City/Township Disposition
West Valley City (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build the freeway on SR 111. • Choose a preferred alignment as soon as possible; can't improve or sell property until you do. • How do you acquire property? Will I get what the house is worth? • Don't take my home; I can't afford to move. • Provide both bus rapid transit and TRAX lines. • Build light rail and include east-west lines. • Extend TRAX line to the airport. • Build commuter rail. • Building a freeway on 7200 West will destroy the "rural feel" out here. • I am buying/building/selling property along the proposed route – how will the facility affect me? 	
Magna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inequity of tolling a facility on the west side. • Build the freeway on 5800 West because it is in the power corridor and will affect fewer people. • Building a freeway on 7200 West will isolate Magna, destroy its "rural feel," reduce property values, and destroy homes. • Build the freeway on SR 111 so it won't affect so many people. • Choose a preferred alignment as soon as possible; property decisions on hold; lots of frustration. • I am buying/building/selling property along the proposed route – how will the facility affect me? • Provide more mass transit services to Magna. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realize need for project. • Concern about community impacts. • Strong opposition to 7200 West freeway due to perceived community impacts, including property values and altering rural character of Magna. • Suggests inclusion of SR 111 and improvements to east-west arterials. • Concern with connectivity between highway and transit line. • More concern with future transit farther west as a part of long-range transportation plan.
Kearns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inequity of tolling a facility on the west side. • Preserve open space, natural landscapes, and wildlife. • Improve existing east-west roads first; that's the real problem. • Impact on 7200 West and 5800 West too great; use 8400 West/ SR 111/ Bacchus Highway. • Provide more mass transit to Kearns area. • Provide more buses and build light rail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in access to MVC (interchanges). • Revised alignment from Western Transportation Corridor alignment removes direct impacts. • Kearns Town Council passed resolution stating opposition to tolling and asserting the need to improve 5600 West as a free alternate route if MVC is tolled. • Interested in connectivity between highway and transit.



CHAPTER 30: PUBLIC AND AGENCY CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

▲ ▲

City/Township	Public Comments	City/Township Disposition
West Jordan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inequity of tolling a facility on the west side; generally unsupportive of tolling MVC. • Concern about ongoing development near MVC alignments. • Preserve open space, natural landscapes, and wildlife. • Improve east-west roads first. • Accommodate planned and existing bicycle and pedestrian trails. • Plan for the future, address current congestion, and complete project as soon as possible. • I am buying/building/selling property along the proposed route – how will the facility affect me? • Provide light-rail service north, south, east, and west. • Expand light-rail system farther west to key destinations such as campuses and shopping centers. • Increase bus service north, south, east, and west. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the project. • Adopted resolution supporting revised alignment from Western Transportation Corridor alignment. • Concern about impacts and improvements to east-west arterials. • General support for the project. • Supportive of Growth Choices process. • Interested in making land uses with master plan (currently under development) compatible with transit.
South Jordan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit air, noise, wildlife, and open-space impacts. • Concern about cost of this project (environmental study and construction). • Unsupportive of tolling MVC. • Freeway could affect planned, future development. • Improve east-west roads. • Build freeway that is aesthetically pleasing. • Build light-rail lines north-south and east-west. • Don't build light rail. • Build commuter rail. • Extend light rail to the airport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for the project. • Expectation that city's future growth depends on the MVC. • Defers to Kennecott as the main player. • Some concern about tolling. • Concern with Mid-Jordan light-rail line. • Supportive of Growth Choices process.

▼ ▼



City/Township	Public Comments	City/Township Disposition
Riverton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build freeway as far east from Foothills Subdivision as possible to leave room for the new high school being built by school district which will serve neighborhood to the west. • Improve east-west roads; build connection between Bangerter Highway and I-215. • Preserve the foothills and open space. • <i>No specific transit comments from the public.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the project. • Concern with noise and visual impacts to residential neighborhoods. • Supportive of Growth Choices process. • Wants to make sure Riverton has easy access to south end of TRAX line.
Herriman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am buying/building/selling property along the proposed route – how will the facility affect me? • Build the freeway as soon as possible. • Improve east-west traffic; that's the real problem. • Build a full freeway with interchanges, not another Bangerter Highway. • Preserve open space; add trails. • Add more buses. • Build light rail or implement bus rapid transit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the project. • Perceives a desperate need for improved travel options, capacity, and access. • Supportive of Growth Choices process. • Interested in making land uses in master plan (currently under development) compatible with transit. • Strong interest in trying to get the southern part of proposed MVC transit line rolled in to Mid-Jordan light-rail transit project.





Table 30.7-2. Summary of Utah County Comments

City	Public Comments	City Disposition
American Fork	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want plans for light rail, bus rapid transit, and commuter rail. Concern about right-of-way impacts. Concern about design of freeway where it connects to I-15. Concern about alleviating east-west congestion; if and when it will happen. Mixed support for all alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the project. Concern with MVC's consistency with existing land-use plans, particularly related to interchange locations.
Eagle Mountain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want a freeway that addresses north-south and east-west traffic needs. Support Southern Freeway Alternative. Want increased public transportation such as light rail, bus rapid transit, buses, and commuter rail. Concern about project timeline addressing tremendous area growth. Concern about preserving natural environment and open space. Concern about ongoing development increasing impacts. Unsupportive of tolled facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong support for the project. Strong sense of urgency that MVC is needed as soon as possible.
Lehi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed support for all alternatives with strong concern about freeway impacts. Concern about impacts from all alternatives. Want increased public transportation such as light rail, bus rapid transit, buses, and commuter rail. Concern about project timeline not addressing tremendous area growth and related increased impacts. Feel their voice is not being heard and that they would be unfairly affected in order to solve a problem caused by development in Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High level of concern about community impacts. Requested study of freeway alignment at Point of the Mountain.
Lindon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Only public comment from one family and therefore unable to generalize.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the project. Concern with interchange location and design, particularly regarding the Pleasant Grove-Lindon interchange at I-15.





City	Public Comments	City Disposition
Pleasant Grove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want TRAX line from Salt Lake County to Utah County; improved bus service. Prefer the Southern Freeway Alternative. Concern about preservation of open space and the landscaping of new freeway. Concern about growth. Concern about cost and potential tax increases. Concern about 2100 North freeway impacts to I-15. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the project. Concern with interchange location and design, particularly regarding the Pleasant Grove–Lindon interchange at I-15.
Saratoga Springs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want quick, direct connection between Eagle Mountain/Saratoga Springs and I-15. Want east-west TRAX line; improved bus service. Concern about project timeline not addressing tremendous area growth; less concerned about tolled facility if road gets built more quickly. Concern about preservation of open space. High level of concern about impacts to Loch Lomand and Harvest Hills developments. Concern about effectiveness of 2100 North freeway for southbound travelers, but support 2100 North arterial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong support for the overall project. Strong sense of urgency that MVC is needed as soon as possible. Concern about community impacts related to Southern Freeway alignment. Strong support for 2100 North Freeway Alternative.
Bluffdale ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build a full freeway, not another Bangerter Highway. Provide equestrian underpass to the foothills. Provide more transit to southern Salt Lake County; don't leave Bluffdale out. Provide connections to commuter rail. Build intermodal hub on Porter Rockwell Boulevard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the project. Concern with interchange locations and connection to I-15. Strong support for Porter Rockwell Boulevard alignment. Perceives a desperate need for improved travel options, capacity, and access. Wants to see Draper light-rail transit extension connect to Porter Rockwell Boulevard. Wants commuter-rail station at Porter Rockwell Boulevard.
Utah County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No public comments specifically attributed to unincorporated Utah County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the project.
^a Bluffdale is included in the Utah County summary since the Porter Rockwell alignment through Bluffdale is part of the Utah County alternatives.		



30.8 Use of Public and Agency Comments in the Study Process

30.8.1 Scoping

During the scoping period, about 275 people submitted a total of more than 700 comments. The MVC EIS team reviewed all comments and developed more than 300 suggested actions and/or alternatives. Public and agency input during scoping enabled the project team to compile a comprehensive list of potential transportation solutions and understand issues of concern. After scoping was complete, the MVC EIS team continued to accept and address comments from the public, agencies, and municipalities.

30.8.2 Purpose and Need, Development of Alternatives, and Refinement of Alternatives

The MVC EIS team solicited additional input from relevant federal, state, and local government agencies and the public after the formal scoping period. Information about the project's purpose and need and the alternatives was disseminated through meetings, a project Web site, local libraries, and other high-traffic areas in the MVC study area. Opportunities to submit comments were provided through meetings, the project Web site, comment drop boxes, a telephone comment line, e-mail address, fax number, and mailing address. Comments helped refine alternatives and identified areas of concern as the project team worked to minimize potential impacts.

30.8.3 Responding to Questions and Anticipating Issues

All public, agency, and local government input received during the EIS process was reviewed and summarized in the project stakeholder database. Hard copies of comments, along with any response, were filed in the project file. If a comment included a specific question or a request for personal contact, the team responded to that stakeholder by e-mail, letter, or phone call. About 3,000 comments were received during the study process. Public involvement staff compiled all comments and questions received in a monthly report that was distributed to the MVC EIS team.

Comments were also reviewed in order to identify current issues that were important to the public and potential issues or questions that could arise in the future. The project team developed public information materials based on key issues identified in public feedback.

30.9 Summary and Conclusion

Public participation was an important part of the MVC EIS process. The MVC EIS team made a commitment at the beginning of the project to encourage and solicit public participation and feedback throughout the life of the project. The project team selected communication tools that best addressed the public's need for information and provided a variety of methods for public comment. The implementation of both wide-reaching and targeted public and agency consultation strategies produced positive results for the project team and enabled a transparent public process to support the NEPA decision-making process.

Comments helped the project team identify key project issues and refine potential transportation solutions. Public, agency, and municipal participation indicated important community values to consider in the EIS process. In response, the MVC EIS worked to address each issue in preparation of the Draft EIS.

▲ ▲

30.10 References

Parsons Brinckerhoff

- 2003 Scoping Report. November 20.
- 2004a Alternatives Screening Report. July.
- 2004b Alternatives Rollout Results Report. November.

▼ ▼